DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 234 SO 010 109

AUTHOR Tomasi, Lydio F.
TITLE The Ethnic Factor in the Future of Inequality.
INSTITUTION Center for Migration Studies, Inc., Staten Island, N.Y.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 39p.
AVAILABLE FROM Center for Migration Studies, 209 Flagg Place, Staten Island, New York, New York 10304 ($1.00 paperbound)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Background; Cultural Factors; *Cultural Pluralism; *Ethnic Groups; Ethnic Studies; Futures (of Society); Group Membership; Human Dignity; Immigrants; *Social Change; Social Development; Social Problems; Social Responsibility; *Social Stratification; Social Structure; Social Systems; Social Values; *Sociology; Theories; *United States History

ABSTRACT

The paper analyzes how the attempt to assimilate ethnic groups into American society has contributed to social, economic, and political inequality. The hypothesis is that the official model of classical sociology has blinded us to a vast range of social phenomena which must be understood if we are to cope with the problems of contemporary America. While not often explicit, the American ideal that ethnic groups should be incorporated into the melting pot has created a society in which many observable forms of inequality are perpetrated. This stratification analysis extends the concept of poverty beyond the narrow limits of income to include political and personal relations. Among issues addressed are immigrant history, social acceptance, power and elitist vs. minority perspectives on education, religion, opportunity, and self-concept. A theory of ethnicity is advanced which explains ethnic identification as an integration of belongingness, self-esteem, the need for community relationships, symbolic interaction, and human understanding. The conclusion is that the ultimate aim of social policy in a democracy is to eliminate various forms of institutionalized inequalities rather than ethnicity, which is a basic right. References are included in the document. (Author/DB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED141234

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Alba delle Cava
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

THE ETHNIC FACTOR

in the

FUTURE OF INEQUALITY

by

Lydio F. Tomasi

SP 010109

Center for Migration Studies
209 Flagg Place
Staten Island, New York 10304

Copyright © 1973
by Center for Migration Studies of New York, Inc.
All rights Reserved

CONTENTS

I.	A Forgotten Dimension of Inequality.....	1
II.	Elitist vs. Minority Perspectives.....	5
III.	Toward a Theory of Ethnicity.....	14
	1. Belongingness and Self-esteem.....	18
	2. The Dialectic of Community in Human Relationships.....	21
IV.	Conclusion.....	26
	Notes.....	29

THE ETHNIC FACTOR IN THE FUTURE OF INEQUALITY

I. A Forgotten Dimension of Inequality

The riots of the 1960's when the American nation has never been more powerful or more prosperous made it uncomfortably clear that great changes have taken place within our society - "we apparently have failed to understand them and certainly we have failed to handled them."[1] The shifting of social conflict showed that development can no longer be defined strictly in terms of a growing gross national product or even of social objectives such as land reform or equal opportunity of employment. Instead, development must be conceived of in terms of the total liberation of individuals to fulfill their human potential. While acknowledging the role of economics in development and that many problems of ethnicity reflect resentment at various forms of institutionalized inequalities, we cannot, from this perspective, speak of developed and developing groups in plural societies. In our national experience, economic gains are not automatically translated into gains in other important realms of life. Consequently, our stratification analysis must extend the concept of poverty "beyond the narrow limits of income to the qualities of political and personal relations,"[2] making policies and programs relevant and appropriate to the

life styles of their intended consumers.

Immigrant history reveals that the first organized efforts of immigrants aimed to secure basic goals: a job, money, decent housing, equal treatment. "After these goals were substantially achieved, the immigrant began his quest for status. This was, of course, a more elusive endeavor because status is granted by others and does not depend solely on money."[3] As one might expect, the technical and material improvements are less subject to the veto of dominant groups than are changes in economic and political institutions. And when the demands of the depressed groups are for economic or political change, such change is apt to be viewed simply as a necessary means for attaining more palpably beneficial ends. Also, the host society, not succeeding in rapidly fitting the large numbers of newcomers into the prescribed mold, developed a new model which promulgated the promise of equal share in the transcending vision of the future and the hope for a "piece of the pie," if not for the immigrant himself, then, at least, for his children. But this philosophy could not succeed because of the false promise of equality involved. By trying to melt into the allegedly superior blend, the ethnic person had to give up his identity and live on the hope of some mystical metamorphosis.[4]

In The Poor and the Powerful, Saul D. Alinski wrote that a person "is also poor if he lacks power." Power now

claimed by various ethnic groups in American society is something still undefined and it is unclear to many where this power concern is going. There is no doubt for Miller and Roby that it is a force in the struggle to reduce inequality, where "new institutions will be constructed, sometimes in anticipation of the pressure and the need for change, more frequently in reluctant capitulation to little understood demands."[5] The unsettledness of those who were left behind in the great migration is a kind of poverty that encompasses "the disparity between their newly found comparative affluence and the obstacles to full social acceptance,"[6] which presupposes the destruction of the lower middle class bigotry as well as the hidden respectable one of the upper-class liberalism.[7] Being included in society, "which means being accorded respect and accepted in social and political relations with others, is increasingly an important part of the issue of inequality."[8] Immigrants were not just numbers. They were not 'economic men' who simply played out their appointed roles in the scenarios of class conflict. Viewing the Rise of American Civilization in terms of a Marxist economic determinism was not conducive for Charles Beard to an appreciation of the subtle play of ethnic influences.[9] The United States got a good deal more out of immigration than just people. It acquired an "immigrant culture," brought over by the "huddled masses" no matter how tired and poor they were. In the stratification analysis of American society it is not a valid assumption to define a group economically in

class terms and then pursuing the other behavior components of this class group. Demographic statistics, substantiating the common observation of an urban ethnic working class,[10] let economic homogeneity overshadow the ethnic diversity of that large group. Further controls on economic mobility indicate that the working class is not "all the same."[11] And socioeconomic factors alone appear to be sufficient in accounting for only a small portion of ethnic residential segregation.[12] Although in the United States ethnicity[13] and social class are directly related, and the concepts of ethnicity and social class become blurred in empirical situations, they still separate a vertical from a horizontal stratification. Inequality in social class relations refers essentially to distribution of material rewards and to opportunities for development. For ethnic groups, "discrimination" and "fear of diversity" are the basic problems, and the acceptance of differences is the key principle involved. The complete equation of social class and ethnicity must lead to a caste-like social structure. In his most generalized aspects for dialectic relationship between ethnicity and social class becomes the dialectic and the complementary interplay between the particularistic and the universalistic elements and between the diffused cultural approaches in ethnicity and the specific rational interest in social class. Also, the politicalization of ethnicity can be a simple exploitation of it. A new set of government leaders, including ethnic groups, will

not be enough to satisfy the demands of representation. A transformation of power must take place. Alone, neither growing economic affluence nor political democracy constitute the good society. On the other hand, even an expanded dimension of stratification may become, when we introduce ethnic differentiation, entangled with vertical or hierarchical systems and the "premise of inequality."[14] It can remain on a mere hortatory level, if it still presupposes a homogeneous, though benign, culture, and does not break down the wall of social and psychological exclusion, and affirms our common humanity with the rest of mankind. There will be consequences, then, to the way we chose to understand our ethnic experience.

II. Elitist vs. Minority Perspectives

In the area of the reemerging issues of culture and ethnicity - surrounding the prestige of various groupings in society and the nature of the interactions among groups - goals and targets are not clear cut. "Coming to see one another as persons will be a long time struggle for a society that first embraced racism and then comfortably denied its existence."[15] For a society that - in rhetoric, at least - is pictured as socially democratic, information on these patterns over a period of time is helpful in de-

picting the extent to which gulfs between groups are being narrowed; and a more systematic collection of information will force reexamination of broad global tenets and specific behaviors which are poorly articulated and understood.

In his survey of the trends of ethnic history, Robert P. Swierenga labelled the major perspectives of America's professional historians as nationalist-nativist, filiopietistic, progressive, scientific and ethnocultural.[16] While the assimilation theme continued to dominate ethnic scholarship, in the last decade the ethnocultural or pluralistic approach, now known as the behavioral view of ethnic history, seeks to understand American history in terms of the unique ethnoreligious groups comprising American society. The bitter debates over Prohibition, Sabbatarianism, naturalization laws, parochiaid and foreign language usage in public schools support the contention that conflict rather than harmony is the hallmark of the pluralistic American society. There is clearly a history of violence and ethnic strife in the American past, as well as a history of social mobility and accomodation.[17]

Conflicts and frustrations of ethnic life in America have often been minimized or overlooked by sociologists who have favored the assimilation perspective and have also assumed the willingness of American minorities to assimilate into the mainstream America. Karl Marx notwithstanding, class consciousness has been relatively episodic in American history.

But race, color, and creed have plowed a maze of deep furrows across the American nation. The knowing answers which social science has offered for its traditional social problems are inapplicable to such issues as ethnic group relations. L. Paul Metzger attributes the failure of most American sociologists to take into account the role of ethnicity in American life to the theoretical framework based on a cultural myth through which they have viewed the social reality of race relations in the United States.[18] That framework rests essentially on the image of American society which has been set forth by American liberalism, wherein the minority problem is defined in the narrow sense of providing adequate, if not equal, opportunity for members of minority groups to ascend as individuals into the mainstream culture. Such incorporation is viewed as virtually inevitable. Moreover, successful assimilation has been understood as synonimous with equality of opportunity, i.e. the opportunity to discard one's ethnicity and to partake in the "American Way of Life." For those sociologists who have taken the position that racial assimilation is the key to the American social problem, the nature of modern American society implies that ethnicity is incompatible with major features of modern social organization and hence will eventually "wither away." The theory of eventual assimilation was more clearly stated by Robert E. Park and presupposed by Gunnar Myrdal and Arnold Rose, but it is rooted in what is perhaps the major theme of modern sociological theory - the shift, in Cooley's terms,

from 'primary' to 'secondary' relations as the basis of social order. Whether phased in terms of the Parsonian pattern variables, the older formulations of Weber, Durkheim, Cooley, Toennies, Troeltsch, or Myrdal's American creed, it is clear that this tradition of sociological theory views ethnicity as a survival of primary, quasi-tribal loyalties, which can have only a disfunctional place in the achievement-oriented, rationalized, and impersonal social relationships of modern bureaucratic order. The ultimate in the pilgrimage from gemeinschaft to gesellschaft is Warren G. Bennis and Philip E. Slater's The Temporary Society, whose members' lives are completely shaped by the functional necessities of technological industrialism.

The social reality in America urged a check on the tendency to regard ethnic movements as extremist or escapist, and essentially deviant pathological phenomena, or to arrogantly write off all white ethnics as 'hard hats', 'fascist' or 'racist.' It also urged to put to a test the tenets of the classical theoretical tradition implying the inevitable disappearance of "particulatistic solidarities." The general validity of the crucial sociological insight of the last century which has noted the dramatic shift in the style of human action under the pressures of urbanism and industrialism does not warrant a simple-minded, evolutionary interpretation.[19] Its breakdown will only occur through a protracted process of social conflict and at least some degree

of restructuring of the existing institutional arrangements of the society. Most Americans grew up with the idea that a community was made up of individuals with neither class, blocks nor groups conspiring to put self-interest above community welfare. Were temporary groups, cliques, or classes to form, assured James Madison, in time they would disappear. It was a middle class society which gave birth to democratic political institutions and to a philosophy of equalitarianism which became firmly entrenched as a permanent American ideal and persisted through periods when it was no longer in accordance with economic and social reality. Homogeneity may have been affected symbolically, but not practically, by the presence of others of different race, religion, or nationality. The first great threat to this predominantly homogenous community came with the new immigration of the 1880's. In consequence of their great numbers and their religious and ethnic differences these immigrants had a profound effect. Ethnic segregation characterized the major American cities and paved the way for ethnic politics, which was strongly resented. But the conservatism which had captured America based on Adam Smith's economics and John Calvin's ethics, was ill suited to a dynamic industrial capitalism and a heterogeneous population. Roosevelt "made the religioethnic group viable and politically relevant; Kennedy made it respectable."[20] In the official rhetoric, ethnic groups appeared less an Old World hangover and more an authentic part of the American community. In theory, the failure of the melting pot was acknowledged.

The answer to ethnic diversity was no longer dissolution and assimilation. The religioethnic group was seen as a permanent part of the American scene sanctioned by the new doctrine of pluralism. But in fact all the pressures of both elite social theory and official social practice have been toward assimilation. Throughout its history American society never approved of its ethnic groups, though it accepted individual immigrants. The United States is the only immigrant-receiving country which does not recognize the principle of group adjustment for immigrants and evokes instead strict principles of individual change, adjustment, and allegiance. An exception to the assimilation approach has now been made for the blacks. The Poles and the Germans before them were not allowed to maintain a distinctive pluralistic culture. Blacks are now encouraged to develop their own distinctive heritage,[21] but in both cases mainstream America persists in defining distinctiveness as separation and in identifying integration with assimilation. Ethnicity is attacked as a "phony issue" and even to speak about ethnic diversity may be wrong, since it emphasizes what is different instead of what is the same. But diversity does not mean separatism. As Ralph Ellison said in his Invisible Man: "America is woven of many strands: I would recognize them and let it so remain. Our fate is to become one, and yet many - this is not prophecy but description." To accept ethnic diversity, then, does not mean that America sub-

stituted for its goal of a unitary integrated community of individuals, a compartmentalized society of separate groups, if we know how to distinguish between pluralism and separatism and between integration and assimilation.[22] "By each of us becoming more profoundly what we are, we shall find greater unity, in those depths in which unity irradiates diversity, than by attempting through the artifices of the American 'melting pot' and the cultural religion of science to become what we are not."[23] Sociology has to refocus itself from the perspective of ethnic groups, to develop its theories "from the area of human oppression," and its methodology "from a calculation of the distance between universal human values and existential realities."[24]

Since the sixties, in quick succession after the black culture was exhausted, Indian, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Chinese, German, Italian, Greek, Irish, and Polish American cultures have been dissected. Now America's oldest minority, the WASP, has been thrust into the public eye, together with the newcomers: Ukranian, Slavs, Portuguese and Haitians. Programs of ethnic studies are urged to provide for the study of all the ethnic groups. "Ethnicity is our history. It did not begin with the memory of the newest arrivals. Its marks are to be read in the substrata of everyone of our major institutions."[25] Increases in education and income, geographical dispersion and intergroup contacts did not lessen ethnic awareness in America society.[26] Behavioral and perceptional

differences persist along ethnic lines.[27] "Whether we like ethnic groups or not really doesn't matter very much; they are concrete realities with which we must cope."[28]

It is the contention of this paper that the official model of classical sociology has blinded us to a vast range of social phenomena which must be understood if we are to cope with the problems of contemporary America. A simple, undirectional evolution from gemeinschaft to gesellschaft has not taken place. The basic ties of friendship, primary relationships, land, faith, common origin and consciousness of kind still persist. These 'primordial ties' have been transmuted by the immigration experience but they have not been eliminated. On their substratum has been erected a complex society with vast pyramids of corporate structures. Their persistence is not a 'problem' about which 'something must be done' but a social asset. A new perspective on American ethnic relations will recognize that forces producing ethnicity as well as forces favoring assimilation are operative in American society today. A realistic analysis of the ethnic situation will take both into account, abandoning the idea that ethnicity is a disfunctional survival from a prior stage of social development. This will make it possible for sociologists to reaffirm that minority-majority relations - one aspect of ethnicity - are in fact group relations and not merely relations between prejudice and victimized individuals. As such they are implicated in the

struggle for power and privilege in society. On the basis of an assessment of the forces which generate the sense of ethnic identity even within the homogenizing confines of modern society, sociological analysis can point to the possibilities of conscious intervention in the social process to achieve given ends and to weigh the costs and consequences of various policy alternatives. Social policies "reflect social values, and social values reveal what is important to a group or a nation. Policies toward outsiders and the 'poor' are especially revealing of what is important to the dominating group."[29] What is perceived as important affects significantly government action that, in turn, affects persons' wellbeing, and the relationship to the means of production and to the means of power. Moreover, positive self-image is one goal which many would accept as a societal obligation: "The differential distribution of positive feelings about one-self is perhaps the essence of inequality."[30] "In both obvious and subtle ways the group colors a man's view of himself and what he expects of the world. The culture which it transmits helps or hinders him in the competition he faces from the cradle to the grave. It often provides the auspices for individual activity, and through a network of agencies and organizations it can exert a large measure of control over an individual's life chances. Indeed, what group one is born into is a matter of some im-

portance."[31] It is the thesis of this paper that ethnicity is one of the important and significant resources of strength in a society and an unsuppressible dimension of wellbeing, and that theories and policies of cultural absorption are unsound. Consequently, a pluralistic philosophy governing intergroup and general human relations in society should be adopted in order to fully legitimize the ethnic groups in the mind of whole populace and to induce their successful functional operation. The manner of dealing not only with the ever-present poverty but also with ethnicity will show our values and our style.

III. Toward a Theory of Ethnicity

Pluralism in America has been a pragmatic approach. The immigrants were not welcome as a group by the American society and considerable pressure was put upon them to become Anglo-Saxons as quickly as possible. "Yet the pressures stopped short of being absolute, the American ethos forced society to tolerate religious and ethnic diversity even if it did not particularly like it."[32] But pluralism has yet to be defined in any comprehensive way. American sociologists[33] focusing their analysis on ethnicity pointed out that Europeans in a stable society looked to the group

as a countervailing force against the power of the state; but Americans in a mobile, dynamic, and atomistic society turned to it for social purposes, a feeling of belonging and communal integration. The ethnic group as a social collectivity is to some extent a creation of the American environment. Ethnic groups have emerged in this country because members of various immigrant groups have tried to preserve something of the intimacy and familiarity of the peasant village during the transition into urban industrial living. They have persisted because of an apparently very powerful drive in man toward associating with those who possess the same blood and the same beliefs he does. The inclination toward such homogenous groupings simultaneously enriches the culture, provides for diversity within the social structure and considerably increases the potential for conflict, because by reinforcing exclusiveness, suspicion and distrust, they serve as ideal foci for conflict.

While Gunnar Myrdal failed to understand American society when he assumed that this contradictory behavior reflected a moral dilemma, it is not clear in which sense this must be the accepted differentiated structure of our social order.

The widespread existence of ethnic subcommunities and their importance have made our society vastly more complex than our ideas of town-hall democracy. But why have ethnic groups persisted as important collectivities long

after the immigration trauma receded into the background? If the ethnic group provides self-identification, when does one so define himself? If the "urban villagers" reveal more working class values than specifically ethnic values, why do ethnic differences persist even when different social classes are examined separately? If ethnic groups are "interest groups", why was not social class or trade unions the membership around which American city dwellers could rally, as it was in England? If Will Herberg's answer in converting ethnicity into religion seems premature when we consider the countless ethnic subdivisions within the three major religious groupings in America, are religious values more intimately linked to ethnicity or do religious differences have substantial ethnic components in them?

Relating ethnicity to "blood and land" and "primordial affinities of ineffable significance,"[34] or Gordon's "peoplehood," or Weber's "consciousness of kind," or Francis' "pilgrimage from peasant village to industrial metropolis," or Greeley's "something basic or primordial in the human psyche," or to define ethnic ties as "the basic group identity," "a powerful forming element in the individual psyche and individual personality,"[35] does not provide us with an adequate answer. The positive and negative aspects of ethnicity may be related to developmental and situational factors but they are not dialectically explained.

The crucial factor in terms of the continuity of an ethnic group is ethnic identification.[36] In Erik H. Erikson, who went beyond Freud in his effort to deal more specifically with the link between the individual and the group, between the child and society, between the lonely ego and the crowd, the nature and functioning of ethnic group identity remains still blurred. It remains something "as unfathomable as it is all-pervasive. One can only explore it by establishing its indispensability in various contexts." It is "a process 'located' in the core of the individual and yet also in the core of his communal culture, a process which establishes, in fact, the identity of these two identities," whose interplay "could be conceptualized only as a kind of psychosocial relativity."[37] It is hard to question that the assumed "givens" of social existence or the biological holdings with which every person is involuntarily endowed at birth by the chance of where, of whom, and when he is born - blood ties, race, region, language, custom, unique history and values, inner coherence, shared sameness, obscure emotional force, safe privacy, inner mental construction - are powerful influences that reach the individual through the group into which he is born. The anthropologist Clifford Geertz[38] distinguishes these bonds from other kinds - class, party, business, union, profession - pointing out that the groups formed out of such bonds do not, as such, become "candidates for nationhood."

These are heavy facts of life with profound positive and negative effects on the whole of human experience.

1. Belongingness and Self-esteem.

The functioning of the basic group identity has to do more crucially with two key ingredients in the make up of every individual's personality: his sense of belongingness and the quality of self-esteem. Other secondary sources of belongingness and self-esteem serve only where the conditions created by the basic group identity do not get in the way.

a - Belongingness.

An individual belongs to his basic group in the deepest and most literal sense that here he is not only alone, but here, as long as he chooses to remain in and of it, he cannot be denied or rejected. It is an identity he might sometimes want to abandon, but it is the identity that no one can take away from him. To set oneself against the group and run the risk of being excluded from it is to put oneself in the painful position of marginality. For the mere fact of belonging gives an incomparable sense of security. One thinks of Frost's line about home being the place where, when you've got to go there, they've got to take you in - or of the house of Muumbi, as Harold R. Isaacs

calls one's commitment to his tribal loyalties.[39] In this age of massive migration, for great numbers uprooted and transported great physical and cultural and social distances, the house of Muumbi is the ark they carry with them, the temple of whatever rules of the game one's forebearers lived by, the "tradition" or "morality" or whatever form of creed or belief in a given set of answers to all the unanswerables.

The primary bonds give a person "genuine security and the knowledge of where he belongs." Through the ethnic group, "he belongs to" acknowledged Erich Fromm in Escape from Freedom, "he is rooted in, as structuralized whole in which he has an unquestionable place." Konrad Lorenz's "territoriality" of man becomes for these uprooted an urge for "social turf" called neighborhood. "Considerable numbers of human beings continue to live in neighborhoods and continue to be deeply attached to their social turf, to view geography and interaction network of their local community as an extension of themselves and to take any threat to the neighborhood as a threat to the very core of their being."[40] The failure of the elite elements in the population to understand this shows that Victor Ferkiss' Technological Man, the Myth and the Reality did not yet destroy the two important contemporary myths of "rapid social change" and "technological man," based on the assumption that a change in technology almost inevitably generates new values, new personalities, new human needs, new patterns of basic behavior. Any

attempt to reform urban society which is not based on a prior attempt to understand, from the 'inside', the part that the neighborhood plays in the lives of many people is doomed to frustration.[41]

b - Self-esteem.

Self-esteem is connected with belongingness. Every individual has to find the supporting measure of self-acceptance or pride-in-self from somewhere to live a tolerable existence. Some people, "passing" into the majority society, can derive a sufficient self-esteem out of the stuff of their individual personalities, above, beyond or despite the character or situation of their group. Others have to depend heavily on their group identities to supply what their own individual lives may too often deny them. And most people need all they can get from both sources. Group identity presents no problems when - like in a tightly homogeneous society or group or in a stable society in which all groups accept their place - it is an assumed given, when self-acceptance it generates is an unquestioned premise of life. But when members of such groups stop submitting to the patterns of self-rejection and self-hate coming out of negative group identities successfully imposed by stronger on weaker groups, and need to acquire, feel and assert their self-esteem, that group identity becomes a source of conflict. It is an intrinsic and inescapable feature of systems incorporating stigmatized ethnic identity.[42] It has been the start-

ing point of the ethnic movement of our own present time.[43]

2. The Dialectic of Community in Human Relationships.

On the other hand, these basic human groupings can become, as Erikson characterizes them, "pseudospecies" - when each uses others as "a screen for projection of negative identites... each affirming its superiority over all others" - as opposed to the specieshood of man, whose recognition is a condition for creating a "more universal, more inclusive human identity." "They let him recognize himself," had already pointed out Fromm, "only through the medium of his, or their participation in a clan, a social or religious community, and not as human beings."

a - Human Intersubjectivity.

If Erikson saw a "psychosocial relativity" between the individual and the group, we have to see also a powerful dialectical relation between them, which are instances of the two poles of Time and Being overarching human experience in its most rational and critical moment of understanding. The subjective pole develops in a development that is social and historical, that stamps the stages of progress with dates. Man is no Leibnizian nomad. He is a social animal and the primordial basis of the human community is not the discovery of an idea but a spontaneous intersubjectivity. The bonds of intersubjectivity make

the experience of each resonate to the experience of others and reach into a past of ancestors to give meaning and cohesion to the group or nation. Born without fixed instinctual determinants of behavior, without any means of self-expression, through symbolic interaction - language as a vehicle of culture - the child acquires in a few days the wealth of thousands of years of civilizations and all the enrichment it brings in explaining and mediating the world to him. A sense of belonging together provides the dynamic premise for common enterprise, for mutual aid and succor, for the sympathy that augments joys and divides sorrows. In developing these cultural and social bonds, man also develops stable and controlled patterns of personal behavior and of attitudes and motivations, making possible the congruence with group patterns but also increasing the complexity of the interpretation process.

Through symbolic interaction, then, man develops what Weber called the consciousness of kind and Znaniecki, national culture societies. The cultural bond integrating individual personality patterns with the social and cultural patterns developed by the group throughout its history and assuring the unfolding of human potentials, is the key element of ethnicity and the main force in the preservation process of group identity. The core of this cultural bond in the primary ethnic groups remains - through the socialization process - under new layers of cultural and social content of

multi-ethnic or even multi-national societies. Intersubjective community survives in the family with its circle of relatives and its accretion of friends, in customs and folk-ways, in basic arts and crafts and skills, in language and songs and dance, and in the inner psychology of the basic group's members. Even in radical cultural changes, intersubjective community remains and provides a cushioning effect, for example, to the cultural shock or alienation which many immigrants experienced.[44] The immigrants needed their ethnic groups for mutual support and for consensual validation of patterns. For in human affairs the decisive factor is what one can expect of the other fellow. Such expectations rest on recognized codes of behavior; they appeal to past performance, acquired habit and reputation; they attain a maximum of precision and reliability among those freguently brought together, guided by similar motives, sharing the same prosperity or adversity. The cultural bond constitutes the basis for society's growth and development. The abiding significance and efficacy of human intersubjectivity is not overlooked, when motley states name themselves nations, when constitutions are attributed to founding fathers, when image and symbol, anthem and assembly, emotion and sentiment are invoked to impart an elemental vigour and pitch to the vast and cold, technological, economic, and political structures of human invention and convention.

The troubled times of crises, however, demand on the part of basic groups, the discovery and communication of new insights and a consequent adaptation of spontaneous attitudes. Unfortunately, the responses of these groups are coupled with the ethos and the interests of the groups that do not regard all changes in the same cold light of the general good of society, and are prone to have a blind spot for the insights that reveal their wellbeing to be excessive or their usefulness at an end. The tendency toward exaggerated ethnocentrism and selfaggrandisement can turn basic groups into factions, marked by clannishness, scapegoating, and sterotyping. By becoming practical - more and more a factor within the technological, economic, political process, more and more a tool that served palpably useful ends - the cultural bond renounces its one essential function and by that renunciation condemns practicality to ruin.

b - Human Understanding.

But besides the elementary communion of intersubjectivity, there are operative in all a drive to understand and an insistence on behaving intelligently that generate and implement common ways, common manners, common undertakings, common commitments. Intelligence is a principle of universalization and of ultimate synthesis. For this reason, it would seem a mistake to conceive with Durkheim, Cooley, the Marxists, and B.F. Skinner[45] the sociological

as simply a matter of external constraint. "It is true enough that society constraints the individual in a thousand ways. It is true enough that the individual has but a slight understanding of the genesis and growth of the civilization into which he was born. It is true enough that many of the things he must do are imposed upon him in a merely external fashion. Yet within the walls of his individuality, there is more than a Trojan horse. He has no choice about wanting to understand; he is committed not by any decision of his own but by nature to intelligent behavior; and as these determinants are responsible for the emergence of social orders in the past, so they account for their development, their maintenance, their reformation. Spontaneously every collapse is followed by a reconstruction, every disaster by a new beginning, every revolution by a new era. Commonly, men want a different social order but, left to themselves, they never consent to a complete anarchy.

There is, then, a radical tension of community. Intersubjective spontaneity and intelligently devised social order possess different properties and different tendencies. Yet to both by his very nature man is committed. Intelligence cannot but devise general solutions and general rules. The individual is intelligent and so he cannot enjoy peace of mind unless he subsumes his own feelings and actions under the general rules that he regards as intelligent. Yet feeling and spontaneous action have their home in the intersubjective group and it is only with an effort and then only in

favoured times that the intersubjective groups fit harmoniously within the larger pattern of social order,"[46] when the good of order has come to terms with the intersubjective groups; it has adapted to its own requirements the play of imagination, the resonance of sentiment, the strength of habit, the ease of familiarity, the impetus of enthusiasm, the power of agreement and consent. The Babel of our day in ethnic group relations is the comulative product of a series of refusals to understand.

IV. Conclusion

The 'primary ties' of ethnic groups, then, are a historical human condition to be reckoned with but not an immovable block in the way of desirable human development. The individual's need not to be alone and isolated is, ultimately, not so much a need to escape Balzac's "moral aloneness" from "lack of relatedness to values, symbols, patterns," but a need to belong and to be through intelligible patterns of relationships. As the dialectic in the individual and in society reveals, man is a compound-intension of intelligence and intersubjectivity. He does not live exclusively either on the level of intersubjectivity or on the level of detached intelligence. On the contrary, his living is a dialectical resultant springing from

these opposed but linked principles. There is a convergence of evidence for the assertion that the dialectic of community is to be met not by any ideas or set of ideas on the level of technology, economics, or politics, but only by the attainment of a higher viewpoint in man's understanding and making of man.

In times of great social and cultural change, knowledge too is changing and because man's coming to know is a group enterprise, such change leaves individuals at a loss. It calls for adjustment and adaptation. Individuals cannot remain in ghettos or go to excess in defensiveness. If they are to operate in a new world, they have to operate on the basis of the social and cultural achievements of this time and place. This disengagement from the past and involvement in the present must be open-eyed, critical, coherent, sure-footed. Individuals and groups in society have a democratic right to ethnic pluralism,[47] based on the deepest human needs. The ultimate aim of social policy is to eliminate various forms of institutionalized inequalities, not ethnicity. With the new Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 our laws seem to be a step ahead of our everyday thoughts and actions. The old models of the melting pot ideas are not entirely wiped out from the institutions of the society, the government, the educational system and the mass media.[48] The ethnic issue forced the rediscovery of complexity in American history. Two hundred years in the making of American society may be

a long time but perhaps not long enough, considering the centuries and millennia that other smaller societies needed for their maturing. It is not just the matter of enjoyment of being together, belonging, communicating, interacting - it is a matter of social responsibilities, of loyalties and solidarities, of deep commitment to other human beings, to groups, and to society, within the bonds of "freedom and dignity."

Nor is knowledge enough. One has to be creative. Modernity lacks roots. Its values lack balance and depth. Much of its science is destructive of man. The contemporary issue of ethnicity, then, is a tremendous challenge and opportunity both to society and to the ethnic groups themselves. To grasp it and to meet its challenge calls for a collective effort toward a richer and more exciting human community. It is not the individual but the group that transforms the culture. The group does so by its concern for excellence, by its ability to wait and let issues mature, by its preserving efforts to understand, by its discernment for what is at once simple and profound, by its demand for the first-rate and its horror of mere destructiveness.

Notes

1. David Danzig, "The Social Framework of Ethnic Conflict in America," in Overcoming Middle Class Rage, edited by M. Friedman (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1971), p. 242.

2. S. M. Miller and Pamela Roby, The Future of Inequality (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1970), p. 9. George Orwell sees it all summed up in Marx's saying that after socialism has arrived, human history can begin.

3. John J. Appel, "American Negro and Immigrant Experience: Similarities and Differences," in The Aliens. A History of Ethnic Minorities in America, ed. by L. Dinnerstein and F.C. Jaher (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970), p. 346.

4. John M. Goering, "The Emergence of Ethnic Interest," Social Forces, vol. 49 (March, 1971), pp. 379-384: "The third generation" Italians and Irish is Providence "returns to the seclusiveness of ethnicity in resentment against unattained promises. A withdrawal from the principles of an universalistic ideology provides the rationale for a new, more heuristic, creed."

5. o.c., pp. 154-155.

6. S. M. Miller and Martin Rein, "Poverty, Inequality, and Policy," in Social Problems: A Modern Approach, ed. by H. S. Becker (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967).

7. See Michael Lerner, "Respectable Bigotry," The American Scholar, vol. 38, No. 4, Autumn, 1969.

8. Miller-Roby, o.c., p. 162.

9. Marxism, relegating ethnicity to the status of "false consciousness," simplistically assumed that minorities and minority problems, as such, will disappear with the cessation of class oppression, but rightly linked racism to the total structure of the society of which it is a part and insisted that the race problem has determinants in the economic institutions and the struggle for power and privilege in the society.

10. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Characteristics of the Population by Ethnic Origin (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, 1970).
Sar A. Levitan, ed., Blue Collar Workers (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971).
Richard Lemon, The Troubled Americans (New York: Simon & Shuster, 1969).

11. David L. Featherman, "The Socio-Economic Achievement of White Religio-Ethnic Subgroups," American Sociological Review, Vol. 36 (April, 1971), p. 211.

12. A. Gordon Darroch and Wilfred G. Marston, "An Examination of the Social Class Basis of Ethnic Segregation," Paper presented at the 5th Annual Meeting of the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, University of Manitoba, 1970.

13. Although the nature and role of ethnicity is discussed later on in this paper, ethnicity may here be operationally defined as diversity in American society caused by the immigration of white ethnic groups from Europe to America between 1820 and 1920 and their relations to the larger society. To underline its universality and persistence, we could distinguish the following types of ethnicity:

    a. Tribal type: cultures of independent tribes tribal groups recently incorporated in newly organized formal societies.

    b. Old World regional type of undifferentiated linguistical ethnicity of Europe and Asis.

    c. Ethnic divisions in multilingual societies such as Switzerland, Belgium, Yugoslavia.

    d. New World ethnicity, where transplanted Old World national cultural groups have assumed the character of ethnic groups. We could subdivide this type into countries with distinct dominant groups, like Latin America, Australia and New Zealand and countries with lack of definite dominance by one group, like North America.

    See also: James Henry Powell, "The Concept of Cultural Pluralism in American Social thought, 1915-1965." (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1971).

14. Donald L. Horowitz, "Three Dimensions of Ethnic Politics," World Politics, 23(2):236-237. Jan., 1971: "In hori-

zontal systems, parallel ethnic structures exist, each with its own criteria of stratification. Although the question of group superiority is far from moot, the groups are not, in a general social sense, definitively ranked in relation to each other. Transactions can occur across group lines without necessarily implying anything about ascriptively based hierarchical relations. Parallel groups therefore have more ability to survive as distinct units... There are wide opportunities for mobility within the ethnic group; one need not choose between his group membership and personal ambition."

15. Miller-Roby, o.c., p. 242.

16. "Ethnocultural Political Analysis: A New Approach to American Ethnic studies," Journal of American Studies, 5(1):59-79. April, 1971. He shows that despite economic assimilation, ethnicity is still as important factor in political behavior.

17. See Deena J. Steinberg, "Historical Survey of Violence in the United States, 1800-1967," unpublished paper, Univiersity of Connectucut, 1970. Of 290 instances of collective violence between the years 1800 and 1967, 203 cases or 70% involved ethnic differences.

18. "American Sociology and Black Assimilation: Conflicting Perspectives," American Journal of Sociology, 76(4): 627-647. Jan., 1971.

19. Pierre L. Van den Berghe, Race and Racism: A Comparative Perspective (New York, Wiley, 1967). His formulation permits the description of America as a "socially pluralistic" society along racial lines despite its cultural homogeneity. He views racial cleavage and conflict as interest in the nature of competitive society, and sees racism as central to the Western cultural tradition.

The Hawthorne experiments of Elton Mayo and his colleagues (The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization,1945) demonstrated how decisive in the supposedly rationalized and formalized factory was the influence of informal friendship groups. From this five-year study carried out by the Department of Industrial Research of the Harvard Business School under the direction of Elton Mayo, financial incentive schemes appeared to be rather less import than the worker's evaluation of his or her work and the social milieu in which that work took place. The

19 (cont'd) character of the intimate group seemed to determine a set of attitudes which in turn bore directly on efficiency, obedience to rules and orders, as well as general satisfaction.

Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy in "Single or Triple Melting Pot" Intermarriage Trends in New Haven," American Journal of Sociology, 49 (Jan., 1944), pp. 331-339, proved that there had been no change in patterns of religious intermarriage for a half century.

Samuel A. Stouffer in The American Soldier: Adjustment during Army Life (Princeton University Press, 1949) showed how decisive personal loyalty was in holding together the combat squad.

Morris Janowitz and Edward Shils in "Cohesion and Disintegration in the Wehrmacht," (Public Opinion Quarterly Vol. 12, p. 300) and E. A. Shils in "The Study of the Primary Group," (The Policy Science: Recent Developments in Scope and Method, eds., D. Lerner and H.D. Lasswell, 1951), proved that the Wehrmacht began to fall apart only when the rank and file soldier begin to lose faith in the paternalistic noncom who held his unit together.

The voting studies of Paul Lazarsfield and his colleagues proved that voting decisions were not made by isolated individuals but rather by members of intimate primary groups; and similar studies of Elihu Katz and others on marketing decisions and the use of innovative drugs showed how such decisions were strongly influenced by informal personal relationships: Bernard Berelson, Paul Lazarsfeld and William McFee, Voting (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954) and Elihu Katz and Paul Lazarfeld, Personal Influence (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955).

E. C. Banfield and J. Q. Wilson in City Politics (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963) emphasized urban politics as an art of power brokerage among various ethnic groups.

More recent research at the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago done in 1961, 1963 and 1967 has shown that there is moderately strong correlation between ethnicity and a number of behavioral attitudinal measures - even when social classes have held constant.

19 (cont'd) Katharine Flood Sandalls, An Investigation of the Differential Fertility Patterns of Irish and Italian Americans (M.A. Dissertation, Georgetown University, 1970). She found that Catholic third-generation women of Irish ethnic origin have higher mean cumulative fertility, higher fertility ideals, and higher fertility expectations than Catholic third-generation women of Italian ethnic origin regardless of the controls imposed on the date for nativity, religiousness, Catholic education or socio-economic status.

See also: U.S. Census Bureau, Fertility Variations by Ethnic Origin (1971) and "Fertility Study Made by the Census. Ethnic Variations Found in Size of Families in U.S.," The New York Times, Nov. 26, 1971, p. 78.

20. D. Danzig, o.c., p. 249.

21. The problems of ethnicity and race are quite dissimilar. Pierre L. Van den Berghe sees Afro-Americans as culturally Anglo-Americans and he thinks that the black militant movement, instead of demanding an equal share of the common national cake, in a fanciful flight from reality, began chasing the wild goose of a mythical African ethnicity.

22. See A. M. Greeley, "Intellectuals and Ethnics," Commentary, 52(5):22-24. Nov., 1971. In answer to: Peter L. Berger, "Inventing the Ethnics," Commentary, 52(1): 82-83. July, 1971.

23. Michael Novak, "White Ethnic," Harper's Magazine, 243(1456): 50. Sept., 1971.

24. Robert H. Mast, "The Forces of Change in the United States: Minority Perspectives." Paper presented at the 1971 Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association.

25. Daniel P. Moynihan, "On Ethnicity," The New York Times, May 2, 1971, p. 15.

26. Michael Parenti, "Ethnic Politics and the Persistence of Ethnic Identification," The American Political Science Review, 61(3):717-726. Sept., 1967. Edward O. Laumann, "The Persistence of Ethnoreligious Differences in the Wordly Success of Third and Later Generation Americans," Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, 1971. Richard M. Scammon, "Ethnic Circumstance: American at the Polls," Paper presented to the Workshop on Urban Ethnic Community Development, Catholic University of America, June 1970.

27. Harold J. Abramson, "Ethnic Pluralism in the Central City," (Storrs, Connecticut: Institute for Urban Research of the University of Connecticut, 1970).

28. A. M. Greeley, Why Can't They Be Like Us? America's White Ethnic Groups (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1971, p. 52.
P. L. Van den Berghe, "The Benign Quota: Paraces or Pandora's Box," The American Sociologist, 6 (Supplementary Issue):40-43. 1971.

29. Miller-Rein, o.c., p. 484.

30. Miller-Roby, o.c., p. 172.

31. D. Danzig, o.c., p. 252.

32. Greeley, o.c., p. 41.

33. Max Weber, "The Ethnic Group," in T. Parsons et al., Theories of Society, Vol. I, p. 305ss. (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1961).
E. K. Francis, "The Nature of the Ethnic Group," American Journal of Sociology, 52 (1945), p393ss.
Florian Znaniecki, Modern Nationalities, 1952.
Nathan Glazer, "Ethnic Groups in America," in Freedom and Control in Modern Society, by M. Berger, T. Abel and C. Page (New York: Van Nostrand, 1954).
Milton M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1964).
N. Glazer and D. P. Moynihan, Beyond the Melting Pot (Cambridge: MIT University Press, 1970).
R. A. Schermerhorn, Comparative Ethnic Relations (New York: Random House, 1970).
Andres M. Greeley, Why Can't They Be Like Us? America's White Ethnic Groups (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1971).
Thomas F. Pittigrew, "Ethnicity in American Life: A Social Psychological Perspective," in Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Ethnicity in American Life (New York: A.D.L., 1971).

34. Edward Shils, "Primordial, Personal, Sacred and Civil Ties," British Journal of Sociology, 8, 1957, p. 139.

35. Harold R. Isaacs, "Group Identity and Political Change: The Houses of Muumbi," APSA, Chicago, Sept. 7, 1971.

36. R. M. Sharan, "Types of Ethnic Identification and General Position: A Study of the Ukrainian Immigrant Group in the U.S.A.," The Ukrainian Review, 18(3):46-78. Autumn, 1971.

37. Identity, Youth, and Crisis (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1968), pp. 22-23.

38. "The Integrative Revolution, Primordial Sentiments and Civil Politics in the New States," in Geertz, ed., Old Societies and New States, New York, 1963.

39. o.c., p. 44.

40. Greeley, o.c., p. 100. Richard J. Krickus, White Ethnic Neighborhoods Ripe for the Bulldozer? (New York: A.J.C., 1970), pp. 27.

41. See, for instance, the Corona Plan, The New York Times, December 2, 3 and 21 of 1971; the "Forest Hills Housing Project," The New York Times, November 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, of 1971; December 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 18, 20, 21, 22, 30 of 1971; and January 5 and 6 of 1972. Nathan Glazer, "When the Melting Pot Doesn't Melt," The New York Times Magazine, Jan. 2, 1972. Also: "Guidelines Proposed to Disperse Subsidized Federal Housing," The New York Times, Sept. 30, 1971. J. Kandell, "Jewish Group Buying Homes in Crown Heights to Stabilize the Community," The New York Times, January 9, 1972, p. 50.

42. Gerald D. Berreman, "Self, Situation and Escape from Stigmatized Ethnic Identity," Paper presented to the symposium on "Issues in the Study of Ethnic Identity," at the 70th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, New York, Nov. 19, 1971.

43. See, v.g., Barbara Mikulski, "Who Speaks for Ethnic America?" The New York Times, Sept. 29, 1970, p. 43. Michael Novack, "White Ethnic," Harper's Magazine, 243(1456):44-50. Sept., 1971.

44. G. P. Allen, "Ethnic Organizations in Canadian Society," International Migration Review, 3(20:67-73. Spring, 1969.

45. Beyond Freedom and Dignity (New York: Knopf, 1971), p. 75.

46. Bernard J. F. Lonergan, Insight. A Study of Human Understanding (London: Longmans, 1961), pp. 215-216.

47. Ethnic Heritage Study Centers, Hearings, General Subcommittee on Education, House of Representatives, 91st Congress, Second Session, 1970, (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.).

48. See, v.g., Sidney Callahan, "Ethnic Think is a Fraud," National Catholic Reporter, Dec., 17, 1971.